

Attorney Docket No.: PRIN-0064  
Inventors: Charles Gilvarg  
Serial No.: 09,402,405  
Filing Date: October 4, 1999  
Page 3

carboxypeptidase A in the biological fluid in the presence and absence of a carboxypeptidase A specific inhibitor, wherein the presence of the carboxypeptidase A specific inhibitor corrects for any extraneous optical density changes resulting from hydrolysis of the substrate or other assay reagents; and

(b) determining whether the measured levels of carboxypeptidase A in the biological fluid of the patient corrected for any extraneous optical density changes resulting from hydrolysis of the substrate or other assay reagents are elevated over levels in biological fluid from a healthy control population.

#### REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant thanks Examiner Leary for the time and consideration in conducting several telephone interviews relating to this case.

Claims 1-5 are pending in the instant application. The Examiner has acknowledged claims 4 and 5 to be allowable. However, the Examiner has maintained the prior art rejections of claims 1-3.

Accordingly, as discussed with the Examiner, in an earnest effort to advance the prosecution of this case and to clearly distinguish the present invention from prior art teachings such as Sugiyama et al. (US Patent 4,432,896) and Brown et al. (1987) in combination with Talley (1990). Applicant is amending claims 1

Attorney Docket No.: PRIN-0064  
Inventors: Charles Gilvarg  
Serial No.: 09,402,405  
Filing Date: October 4, 1999  
Page 4

through 3 to clarify that the measured carboxypeptidase levels are compared to any activity measured in a blank containing the sample and a specific inhibitor of the enzymatic activity to correct for extraneous changes in measurement unrelated to enzymatic activity of the sample. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at page 7, line 31 through page 8, line 19. None of the prior art references teach or suggest a method with this step. Accordingly, this amendment to the claims clarifies the novelty and unobviousness of the instant invention and distinguishes it from the prior art teachings.

Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 and allowance of pending claims 1-5 of the instant application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Massey Licata  
Registration No. 32,257

Date: October 23, 2000

Law Offices of  
JANE MASSEY LICATA  
66 E. Main Street  
Marlton, New Jersey 08053

(856) 810-1515